



5/20/09
S/S

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:) PATENT
Mohamed TAKHIM)
Serial No.: 10/583,735) GROUP: 1793
Filed: August 4, 2006) EXAMINER: COHEN, S. J.
METHOD FOR PRODUCING STRONG) CONFIRMATION NO. 8372
BASE PHOSPHATE) CUSTOMER NO. 25269

* * * * *

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

October 28, 2009

Sir:

The applicant has received the Office Action of April 29, 2009 and has carefully reviewed the examiner's new prior art rejections. He believes that these rejections are without merit and offers the following comments for consideration.

The examiner has rejected claims 19, 2-4, 6-11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter¹ (DE 1667575) (newly cited) in view of MacDonald (newly cited). The examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to substitute a slurry formed by reacting phosphate rock and phosphoric acid (MacDonald) for the pulp in step (a) of Walter. This is quite incorrect!

¹ Should be Knotgen et al.